

Appln. No. 09/892,340  
Amdt. dated December 10, 2004  
Reply to Office Action mailed September 10, 2004

**REMARKS**

Applicant's attorney thanks Examiners McDermott and Landrem for the personal interview conducted on December 7, 2004 in connection with the present application. As a result of the interview, the Examiners acknowledged that the irremovably formed ridge of the present invention is not disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record, including Chaffringeon et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,919,232 (see the Interview Summary dated December 7, 2004). By the amendments requested above, Claim 1 has been amended to recite the foregoing feature of the present invention. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended Claim 1 overcomes the prior art rejections contained in the outstanding Office Action and is therefore in condition for allowance together with the claims depending therefrom (i.e., Claims 2-15, 21 and 22).

To facilitate the Examiner's consideration of amended Claim 1, applicant's attorney reiterates the distinctions discussed during the interview between the present invention and the device of the primary reference relied upon by the Examiner in the Office Action (i.e., Chaffringeon et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,919,232). The present invention as recited in amended Claim 1 includes a ridge which is formed **irremovably** with the mesh layer. In direct contrast to the irremovably formed ridge of amended Claim 1, the filiform element of the Chaffringeon et al. '232 Patent is formed **removably** with the textile sheet. More particularly, the filiform element of the Chaffringeon et al. '232 Patent needs to be extracted from the textile sheet in order to orient same in its flat arrangement from its folded arrangement (see column 3, lines 59-63, of the Chaffringeon et al. '232 Patent). In such circumstances, the Chaffringeon et al. '232 Patent not only fails to disclose the irremovably formed ridge of the present invention but also teaches away from the concept

Appln. No. 09/892,340  
Amdt. dated December 10, 2004  
Reply to Office Action mailed September 10, 2004

of forming such a ridge. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that it would be improper to combine the teachings of the Chaffringeon et al. '232 Patent with the teachings of the secondary references cited in the Office Action, including White U.S. Patent No. 5,728,510.

During the personal interview of December 7, 2004, the Examiners also acknowledged that the monolithically formed ridge of the present invention distinguishes over the prior art of record. This feature is recited in Claim 21 which depends from amended Claim 1.

In view of the foregoing amendments and the above comments, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-15, 21 and 22. Should there remain any questions or other matters whose resolution could be advanced by a telephone call, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact applicant's undersigned attorney at his number below.

It is believed that no fees are attributable to this Amendment. Should there be any fees required as a result of this Amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge them to Deposit Account No. 501402.

Respectfully submitted,

McCARTER & ENGLISH, LLP

  
By. John K. Kim  
Reg. No. 37,002

McCarter & English, LLP  
Four Gateway Center  
100 Mulberry Street  
Newark, New Jersey 07102  
(973) 622-4444, Ext. 2646